REMARKS

Claims 1 - 24 are pending in the application. Claims 1 - 24 have been rejected.

Claims 1 - 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed towards nonstatutory subject matter. Claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended to address this rejection.

Claims 1, 8, 9, 16, 17 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030130899 (Ferguson).

The present invention generally relates to a knowledge management system which includes the ability to flag predetermined systems that have a known exception (i.e., an excursion) and render a solution based upon the known excursion.

More specifically, the present invention, as set forth by independent claim 1, relates to a method for identifying excursions to general solutions provided by a solution network. The method includes identifying excursions to a general solution on a system model basis, saving the excursions within the solution network on a model system basis, and when accessing the solution network, searching the solution network to determine whether an excursion solution exists.

The present invention, as set forth by independent claim 9, relates to an apparatus for identifying excursions to general solutions provided by a solution network. The apparatus includes means for identifying excursions to a general solution on a system model basis, means for saving the excursions within the solution network on a system model basis, and means for searching the solution network to determine whether an excursion solution exists when accessing the solution network.

The present invention, as set forth by independent claim 17, relates to a solution network which includes a knowledge repository, an excursion identifying module, and a search module. The knowledge repository stores information regarding general solutions relating to issues and information relating to excursions to general solutions. The excursions are searchable on a system model basis. The excursion identifying module identifies excursions to the general

solutions on a system basis. The search module searches the solution network to determine whether an excursion solution exists when accessing the solution network.

Ferguson discloses a system for historical database training of non-linear models. The non-linear model is trained with training sets of electronic commerce data. The system detects availability of new training data, and constructs a training set from the corresponding input data. Over time, many training sets are presented to the non-linear model. The training sets are presented each time a new training set is constructed.

The Examiner cites to the following portion of Ferguson to support the contention that Ferguson discloses storing excursions on a system model basis:

> The neural network may be trained using back propagation with historical data or any of several other neural network training methods, as would be familiar to one skilled in the art. The above-mentioned information, including results of previous transactions of the user responding to previous inducements, which may be collected during the e-commerce transaction, may be used to update the predictive model(s). The predictive model may be updated either in a batch mode, such as once per day or once per week, or in a real-time mode, wherein the model(s) are updated continuously as new information is collected (Ferguson ¶ 0154).

However, nowhere within this portion of Ferguson, or anywhere else within Ferguson, is there any disclosure or suggestion of storing and searching excursions on a system model basis as disclosed and claimed. As set forth within the present application, "system model basis" is a basis where information is stored based upon a system model. Merely stating that a "neural network" as disclosed by Ferguson is equivalent to a system model basis is insufficient to overcome the Examiner's obligation to establish a *prima facie* case.

More specifically, Ferguson, taken alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest a method for identifying excursions to general solutions provided by a solution network where the method includes identifying excursions to a general solution on *a system model basis*, saving the excursions within the solution network on *a system model basis*, and when accessing the solution network, searching the solution network to determine whether *an excursion solution exists*, all as required by claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable over Ferguson. Claims 2 - 8 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Ferguson, taken alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest an apparatus for identifying excursions to general solutions provided by a solution network where the apparatus includes means for identifying excursions to a general solution on *a system model basis*, means for saving the excursions within the solution network on *a system model basis*, and means for searching the solution network to determine whether *an excursion solution exists* when accessing the solution network, all as required by claim9. Accordingly, claim 9 is allowable over Ferguson. Claims 10 - 16 depend from claim 9 and are allowable for at least this reason.

Ferguson, taken alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest a solution network which includes, a knowledge repository and an excursion identifying module where the knowledge repository stores information regarding general solutions relating to issues and information relating to *excursions to general solutions* and the excursions are searchable on *a system model basis* and the excursion identifying module identifies excursions to the general solutions on *a system basis* and the search module searches the solution network to determine whether *an excursion solution exists* when accessing the solution network, all as required by claim 17. Accordingly, claim 17 is allowable over Ferguson. Claims 18 - 24 depend from claim 17 and are allowable for at least this reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on June 20, 2007.

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Stephen A. Terrile/

Stephen A. Terrile
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,946